

PPC/PC
(BUREAU FOR POLICY & PROGRAM COORDINATION, OFFICE OF PROGRAM
COORDINATION)

RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4)

1997-1999

30 June 1997

Please Note:

The attached results information is from the FY 2000 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4"), and was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after July 1, 1998

June 30, 1997 11:21 am

DRAFT--Version 5
PPC/PC
Results Review and Resource Request
1997 - 1999

Table of Contents

Part I:	Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance	1
Part II:	Progress Toward Objectives	1
SO 1:	Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive, and readily accessible to USAID SO Teams	1
SO 2:	Resource allocations and program activities conform with existing policy and contribute to specific results targets	9
SO 3:	Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience	14
SO 4:	Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs and other important constituencies bring increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation	18
Part III:	Changes to Management Contract	27
Part IV:	Resource Request	27
Annexes:		
Resource Request Tables		

PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The period covered by this R4 report incorporates the initial year of the PPC Strategy given shape last September. PPC continues to focus in the FY97-FY01 strategy period on four Strategic Objectives (SOs). Several factors have affected the program this year and are likely to remain important throughout the Strategy period. These are:

- a changing organizational (foreign affairs) and management (GPRA) environment, and
- frustration and ennui with further change in an Agency that already has experienced so much change where the direction and structure was unclear.

These factors increase the demand for clear policy and operational guidance. PPC has continued to move forward with the consolidation of unit strategic objectives, incremental installation of "common indicators," improvements to operating unit objective indicators and performance monitoring, and enhanced results reporting and resource allocation processes. It has also undertaken a comprehensive review of agency programming policies, promoted greater integration at the policy level among donor nations and multilateral development organizations, and completed the field testing phase of the New Partnerships Initiative (NPI). Important change is underway in the Agency--and we are making progress. The operational improvements which PPC advocates fit into a broader strategy for increasing the efficiency of USAID programs and building confidence and cooperation of USAID's financiers, partners, and customers.

PART II: PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVES

R4 guidance requires that units indicate whether objectives are on track or require adjustment. As noted above, calendar 1996-97 has been a start-up year for the Strategic Objectives outlined in the PPC budget document submitted to the Agency last September. PPC has now set forth a preliminary set of indicators against which it can report and has developed a package of approaches to encompass its tasks and achieve its objectives. The narratives that follow show significant progress against indicators during the past year.

The results indicators presented here for review and refinement were developed between December 1996 and February 1997, following approval of four Strategic Objectives in September 1996. Baseline data for the FY96-97 period can be gathered for most indicators, but projected targets will be established only after indicators are confirmed and additional analyses completed. Data will be compiled directly by the Bureau from information available within the Agency.

SO#1: Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive, and readily accessible to USAID Strategic Objective teams

1. Performance Analysis

a. Objective Level Summary

The successful application of policy is dependent upon a common understanding of *what policy actually is, what force it has on programming, and what accountability there should be for adherence to policy*. Policy implementation incorporates all steps from development, articulation (guidance), alignment/oversight to liaison and outreach. Therefore, PPC undertook a comprehensive accounting of existing policies, analysis of applicability, accessibility (ADS) and development of key new policies. To identify policy gaps, opportunities for innovative policy development, effectiveness of policies in strategy development, performance and resource allocation, PPC collaborated with other bureaus to identify key successes in performance as well as constraints to progress. Several of these issues, including workforce planning within SOs and resource allocations reflecting strategies and need, among others, will require considerable Agency effort over future months.

While new policies, proposals and plans have been developed for Agency concurrence, the application, accountability and impact remain of concern. Progress towards the successful development and implementation of policy is a shared responsibility. Every unit in the Agency must define programs and results that reflect administration priorities, including, among others, food security, emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases, crisis prevention and mitigation among others. PPC has responded to the responsibility to align policies, strategies, resources and results by working to develop/improve resource allocation guidance, unit strategies, the new Agency Strategic Plan and common indicators for performance measurement. To ensure that Agency policies and guidance reflect not only the best lessons-learned but stimulate and incorporate innovative approaches to development challenges, PPC/SPG also conducts policy research and analysis of development models.

b. Intermediate Result-Level Performance Review:

IR 1.1. Establish and Maintain Currency, Relevancy, Comprehensiveness and Accessibility.

PPC's first step has been to establish an approach to policy review. It will be accomplished by a regular, periodic, "desk review" by PPC and a similar, less frequent, review by outside experts/customers, with recommendations to AA/PPC or the Administrator to endorse, revise or discontinue existing policy. Each Agency policy will carry a date of origination and of each such review. The reviews will analyze whether a policy reflects current reality (budget or political environments, etc.). Remaining policies will be revised or eliminated as appropriate. We believe that relevant and current policies remove a constraint to alignment of strategies and strategic objectives.

Thus far:

- policies have been entered into the ADS as appropriate and all policies have been reviewed for ADS formulation and/or revision; and
- a review system has been instituted and a schedule has been established for incorporation into the ADS format of past policies that remain applicable.

IR 1.2. Relevance to Political/Field Environment. Together with technical officers in G, regional bureaus, missions and implementing partners, PPC will identify key policy issues that have arisen in the context of existing policy. Sector reviews and consultations focus on gaps, constraints and issues related to application of policies and relationship to program activities and results. In pursuit of this result, PPC/SPG has led inter-agency discussions which have:

- reviewed the impact of policies and strategies in program activities for all sectors;
- analyzed the Agency Strategic Plan for consistency with policies and strategies and offered necessary revisions;
- developed a proposal for an additional Agency Goal for Education, and analyzed other proposals on agriculture and equity;
- established procedures for review and approval of program activities in non-presence countries (DG and research);
- developed background papers in a number of politically and developmentally important areas (trade, poverty, gender gaps in education, aid, and effectiveness) that clarify and resolve key policy issues that impact USAID programming;
- incorporated into the overseas restructuring plan DG priority countries and staffing proposals reflecting technical needs;
- reviewed G/DG and ENI procurement issues and recommendations for future planning; and
- developed DG sector group to review policy issues of relevance to DG programming, and coordinated distribution to DG officers worldwide.

IR 1.3. Comprehensiveness.

When there is a disconnect between what USAID asserts as policy and what Congress and other interested stakeholders indicate as priorities, policies and strategies can become irrelevant. Technical and political judgements about Agency budgets, objectives and policies must conform.

- SPG is identifying (with technical staff, missions, partners, stakeholders, etc.) area where existing policy is insufficient and developing new policies which take into account inputs from interested and relevant parties. As a result, the policy framework is being expanded to address new or changing circumstances.
- New policies are being developed this year covering Basic Education, Food Security, Higher Education, Disability, Biodiversity and the Innovative Policy Research Program.
- PPC participated in DG evaluations and assessments to inform policy; e.g., psycho-social healing project in El Salvador, role of media in conflict in El Salvador, Haiti, and Croatia, and participated in analyses of conflict prevention and formulation of recommendations on realistic programming.

Newer areas for strategic interventions that will be factored into this process over the coming year include food security, emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases, and crisis

prevention and mitigation.

IR 1.4. Policy implementation. PPC seeks to assure that strategic approaches adopted by the Agency operating units take into account Agency policy and conform with it. Over the past months, PPC

- worked with agency technical staff to develop common indicators for all sectors;
- made progress on development of quality of partnership indicators; and
- followed each bureau's annual "R4" reviews to find ways of building increased consistency, comparability, and candor into the system.

2. Expected Progress through FY 1999 and Management Actions

During the next 2 years PPC/SPG will

- revise policies to ensure clarity and consistency with the Agency Strategic Plan;
- revise Strategies for Sustainable Development to reflect the consideration of crisis prevention and mitigation approaches and priorities for sustainable development;
- develop policies and/or guidance for consideration of Administration priorities of food security, emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases, and crises prevention and mitigation;
- analyze and revise as appropriate program strategies with regional GHAI strategy;
- analyze key policy issues and prepare issues papers for senior management
 - development record and aid effectiveness
 - gender gaps and general progress in primary education
 - growth, poverty and income distribution
 - growth, policy reform, and U.S. exports
 - capturing innovation: effective partnerships in public-private sector in technologies for international development information and communications technology and international development (with CDIE)
- analyze effectiveness of policy guidance on development of strategies, implementation of Agency reforms;
- analyze policy guidance emphasis on approaches to achieve strategic development goals;
- revise Agency Strategic Plan and Strategic Framework to reflect strategies for infectious diseases and an additional Agency Goal for education;
- revise policy guidance to strategically link humanitarian relief assistance to foster local capacity building and economic and social development;
- analyze and revise as necessary policy guidance to ensure that guidance adequately addresses the obstacles to women's full participation in society and in the economy.

Examples of strengthening policy coordination outside of USAID with other government agencies and development partners during FY98-99 include:

- continued leadership roles in interagency policy groups including Democracy Policy Group and Ciset/NSTC;
- sponsoring (with other Bureaus) informal seminars and policy round-tables to share innovative partnerships and methodologies within and outside USAID;
- continued development of Action Plans for implementing new policies: Higher Education partnership among others; and
- continued leadership in specific topics that enhance interagency and donor coordination: including democracy topics for the Common Agenda, US (Ciset/NSTC) and US-EU Task Forces on Emerging and Re-emerging Infectious Diseases.

The elements of the Bureau's management contract in this area remain valid.

3. Performance Monitoring Tables

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive and readily accessible to USAID Strategic Objective Teams.			
RESULT NAME: SO 1.1: Establish and Maintain Currency, Relevancy, Comprehensiveness and Accessibility of Agency Policies.			
Indicator 1a): Policy review and evaluation system and timetables established.			
Unit of Measure: Policies available on ADS	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/SPG	1998(B)	N/A	
Indicator Description: Dates of origination and review of Agency policies.	1999	Rqst/Actl	
Comments: This indicator tracks whether and when a review of policies is accomplished by PPC. "Review" comprises a periodic desk review by PPC/SPG with appropriate examination by outside experts/customers, with recommendations to AA/PPC or the Administrator to endorse existing policy. Reviews will include analysis to determine whether a policy reflects current priorities, legal requirements, fiscal and other responsibilities, clarity and consistency with the Agency Strategic Plan, and clear guidance on basic requirements for customer focus/Agency reforms. This indicator is a measure of currency to ensure linkages between Agency Goals and Strategic Objectives and Administration priorities.	2000		
	2001		
	2002		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive and readily accessible to USAID Strategic Objective Teams.			
RESULT NAME: SO 1.2: Relevance to political(including OMB and Congress)/field environment.			
Indicator 1 (b): An agenda of priority areas for policy and strategic guidance revision; program activities conform with existing policy and contribute to specific results targets.			
Unit of Measure: Index	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/SPG	1998(B)	N/A	
Indicator Description: Together with technical officers in G, Missions, and implementing partners, PPC will identify key policy issues that have arisen in the context of existing policy. Sector reviews and consultations will identify gaps, constraints and issues related to application of policies and their relationship to the Agency Strategic Plan. From these, an agenda of priority areas for policy revision will be identified. Performance will be measured against the agenda, which will be approved by the AA/PPC will be revised periodically, as necessary, based upon assessments by Agency Senior Management. Revisions will reflect opportunities for new strategies and revisions reflecting changing environments or lessons learned. The agenda list may include such things as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analysis of key policy issues for senior management; - sector and other topical reviews prepared for assessing policy environment and application; - revision of the Agency Strategic Plan/Framework; - revision of Agency 10-year program goals and indicators; or - improvements in guidance for implementation of Agency reforms. 	1999	Rqst/Actl	
	2000		
	2001		
Comments: Program and progress reviews through sector councils and other mechanisms have yielded important information about the applicability of policies. This includes not only the content but also feasibility of strategic guidance. Theoretically, funding allocations and program activities should link directly with strategic objectives and Agency goals. Policies should clarify and guide this development. Sector reviews identify key issues to be addressed for the successful implementation of policies, including resource allocation reflecting strategies and performance and appropriate resources (technical staff and budget) to accomplish objectives. To the degree that a policy issues agenda reflects constraints to alignment of strategies, resources and strategic objectives, it will be a credible index for successful implementation of policies.	2002		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive and available to USAID Strategic Objective Teams.			
RESULT NAME: SO 1.3: New policies and guidance are developed where existing policy is insufficient.			
Indicator 1.3 (c): Policy framework is adjusted to address new or changing circumstances.			
Unit of Measure: Discrete documents and mechanisms	CY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/SPG-OIG	1996(B)		
Indicator Description: The indicator is not quantitative. Program and policy documents will facilitate implementation, adjustment of strategies, revisions of Agency Strategic Framework and Plan. The indicator will track external documents intended to engage a broad audience.	1997		
Comments: As examples, the following policies have been developed: Basic Education Policy, Food Security Policy, Higher Education Community Policy (approved and Action Plan developed), Disability Policy and Action Plan, Biodiversity Policy, Innovative Policy Research Program. Revisions for the Agency Strategic Plan and 10 year performance goals have been developed. There is requirement for developing policy guidance for civil military relations, action plans for new policies, including higher education, community partnership, and disability, Women in Development, and for developing/implementing an innovative research approach program for policy.	1998		
	1999		
	2000		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Agency policy is up-to-date, comprehensive and available to USAID Strategic Objective Teams.			
RESULT NAME: SO 1.4 Policy implementation. Strategic approaches adopted by the Agency reflect Agency policies.			
Indicator: 1.4 Summary reports analyze each bureau's annual "R4" reviews. External reports reflect conformance of program activities with existing policy reflected in specific results targets.			
Unit of Measure: Discrete documents and review mechanisms.	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/SPG	1996(B)		
Indicator Description: The indicator is not quantitative. The analysis of Bureau "R4" reviews , SO evaluations, sector reviews and external reports and communications reflect an ongoing assessment of policies, strategies, and results. This indicator will also track a variety of external documents and communications that reflect Agency priorities and successes.			
Comments: As the common indicators for Agency performance become effectively utilized and resource allocations reflect performance measurement, the analysis and review mechanisms will be facilitated. The development of common indicators with CDIE and technical staff throughout the Agency contributes to both internal assessments and external reports. The development of the quality of partnership indicators also contributes to the performance measurements. Examples of work in this area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lead USG initiative on civil society and democracy under U.S.-Japan Common Agenda and USG initiative on emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases under USG/NSTC/CISSET and US-EU; - Enhance cooperation for programs in health and population in Africa through US-EU NTA; - Enhance policy coordination and consultations with external partners within and beyond USG through panel discussions, policy round-tables, interagency task forces and work groups; - Develop external annual reports (Human rights, OMB/OSTP, SBIR, etc.); - Conduct R4 Policy reviews, BBS reviews; - Review program and country performance as basis for funding recommendations; - evaluations in program target areas; - fora, workshops, etc., on best-practices in learning, participation, re-engineering; - policy coordination with development partners. 	1998		
	1999		
	2000(T)		

SO#2: Agency resource allocations and program activities conform with existing policy and contribute to specific results targets

1. Performance Analysis

a. Objective Level Summary

When applied appropriately, resources allocated under the Agency's performance-based budgeting system will contribute efficiently to Agency achievement of the Agency's performance goals. The FY98 Agency budget reviews, chaired by the Administrator, were marked by efforts to encourage regional and central bureaus to move quickly to complete their performance-based budgeting systems. To the extent that Congressional earmarks and directives permitted, the FY98 Agency Budget Request rewarded bureaus that had employed disciplined applications of this concept and penalized those that had failed to do so.

Since OMB's primary review theme for FY98 was allocation in conformance with performance and results, an accolade received from OMB Director Raines said much about the Agency's 1996 performance under SO 2. Nevertheless, there is still need for increasing the influence of performance on budget allocations across all levels of the Agency.

Though it is not within PPC's authority to decide Agency budget allocations, it can influence the efficiency of program and budget allocations by reflecting back to the Agency--in policy and program initiatives and information/education/communications systems--what it learns from its comprehensive view of Agency programs and experience. It shares responsibility with M and others for maximizing the effectiveness of resources as seen from the Agency-wide level, but it accepts programmatic responsibility for achieving Agency goals and objectives. Thus, the relationship between Agency budget allocations and performance is a special management interest of PPC. During this cycle, PPC has responded to this responsibility with initiatives to:

- improve resource allocation guidance,
- develop a new Draft Strategic Plan and define ten-year performance goals,
- assemble "approach-level" common indicators,
- encourage increased consistency, comparability, and candor in performance reporting and review processes across the Agency,
- build new PM&E policies, essential procedures, and supplemental references
- test electronic information technologies to advance strategic planning and PM&E functions by USAID and its partners,
- improve country and other eligibility criteria for Title III, and
- improve (with BHR) use/reporting/integration of Title II into mission portfolios.

b. Intermediate Result-Level Performance Review:

IR 2.1: Increasing correlation between technical assessments of performance and USAID budget requests to OMB and Congress.

The best measure of our performance in this area is the degree to which performance and policy are reflected in actual budget requests. Leaner budgets and performance and policy-based reviews are leading to more accurate assessments, better differentiation of performance, increased budget discipline, and results-based allocations. Enhanced R4 guidance focuses agency reviews on more crucial elements of performance and is leading to more efficient program and performance reviews.

The process of evaluating performance across the Agency requires close collaboration among all of the Agency's operating units. Broad participation in this work has been and will be key, but PPC plays an important support role through objective, outside review, and through provision of TA, training, publications like TIPS, Best Practices, and the Summer Seminar Series, and "number crunching" activities which support analytic capacity agency wide. Ultimately, success in this IR comes in the degree to which performance is reflected in Agency budgets. (See indicators below.) Agency-wide performance measurement comparability is still not a reality, but uniform "R4" guidance, common weights and factors in objective assessment, and active PC and CDIE participation in R4 reviews brings added uniformity to the reporting process and increased consistency and comparability to performance reviews and assessments across the Agency. CDIE's work to improve the quality and consistency of indicators which operating units use to measure performance contributes directly to this consistency and comparability.

IR 2.2: Increasing correlation between internal technical assessments of performance and actual budget allocations to USAID.

High levels of confidence in USAID technical analysis and reporting, better understanding of USAID's role in the achievement of U.S. national interests, and improved development results should lead to greater appreciation of USAID's work by State, OMB, the White House, and Congress. Policy-based legislative initiatives, quality special reports on Agency programs, quality Congressional testimony, etc., contribute to progress toward this intermediate result. In the future, the USAID Strategic Plan, the Annual Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report will discipline Agency reporting and establish Agency accountability. The nature and quality of the agency data used to judge performance will become an increasingly important factor in complying with the GPRA and improving USAID's ability to manage for results. PPC/CDIE plays an important role here. Much remains to be done--particularly with respect to use of common weights and common indicators--but we have made a good start.

PPC has

- served as the point of contact for several GAO evaluations and Congressional Budget Office (CB) studies and participated in/led numerous meetings with the USAID/IG on GPRA related issues;
- represented USAID on OMB's inter-agency advisory committees which developed government-wide guidance on preparing Agency Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Reports;
- served as GPRA contact with OMB, GAO and Congress regarding PM&E issues (which will become increasingly more important to this process); and
- initiated assembly of "common indicators" at the Agency approach level, established a timetable,

and shared for field comment indicators that are currently being used.

2. Expected Progress through FY 1999 and Management Actions

During the next reporting cycle, PPC will:

- track changes in the Agency's performance monitoring and resource allocation system under new program indices introduced below.
- help operational units improve strategic planning and PM&E and reporting and the use of performance data in managing for results (CDIE).
- develop and disseminate practical field-based guidance through the TIPS series, special seminars, and the Best Practices in Reengineering Series (CDIE).
- in an effort to reenforce understanding of USAID leadership's intention to reduce program burdens and permit increased focus on results, organize a program conference to set forth some basic tenets toward which reengineering leads.
- prepare USAID's first Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan (4th quarter FY97 and 1st quarter FY98, respectively);
- complete the first Strategic Plan-related Annual Performance Report for the FY99 APP (1st quarter FY00).

The elements of the Bureau's management contract in this area remain valid. The R4 review is intended to confirm the contract and validate indicators.

3. Performance Monitoring Tables

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: Resource allocations and program activities conform with existing policy and contribute to specific results targets			
RESULT NAME: SO 2.1: Increasing correlation between technical assessments of performance and Bureau budget requests to PPC and M.			
Indicator 2 (a): Relative percentage of budget requests influenced by other factors than performance			
Unit of Measure: Index	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/PC	1998(B)	BBS: 29% OMB: CP : 37% Actl:	29% 37% N/A
Indicator Description: Distortion Indices: The measure of positive and negative displacement of resources reflected in . . . (insert from below) . . . from the allocations recommended by technical panel performance reviews. ¹ Index 1: . . . Bureau Budget Requests . . . Index 2: . . . the Agency Budget Request . . . Index 3: . . . the Congressional Presentation . . . Index 4: . . . actual Congressional allocations . . .	1999	BBS: 28% To OMB: CP : 33% Actl:	BBS: OMB: CP : Actl:
Comments: Washington bureaus use common factors and weights to cluster unit objectives into quartiles for funding purposes. Clustering by goal area identifies the objectives with the most compelling case for funding at the request level, those with moderate justification, and a lower group whose budget allocation would be first affected in the case of overall shortfalls. Objectives compete with like objectives in other units in a bureau rather than with those in a different strategic goal area. Agency-wide factors and weights are: performance , 35%; contribution to agency goals , 30%; and contribution to bureau priorities , 35%. Theoretically, funding allocation is influenced in the first instance by the three factors but, in reality, it is also influenced by anticipated Congressional earmarks and directives, staffing, and other factors. This indicator measures, by bureau/Agency, the degree to which funding requests are shifted--for whatever reasons--from higher to lower performing objectives because of factors other than performance.	2000	BBS: 27% To OMB: CP : 29% Actl:	BBS: OMB: CP : Actl:
	2001	BBS: 26% To OMB: CP : 26% Actl:	BBS: OMB: CP : Actl:
	2002	BBS: 25% To OMB: CP : 25% Actl: 25%	BBS: OMB: CP : Actl:

¹The system assumes that USAID managers will apply resources in a way that brings those resources most closely in line with Agency technical review panel recommendations. The value of the system is that Congress AND USAID managers contend to bring their requests/allocations closest to technical recommendations. Objectivity requires acknowledgement that allocations could at times come closer than requests. The objective is to establish incentives--through impartial, technical measures--to reduce distortions. The technical reviews must be above question; therefore, they will have to become increasingly more independent, well organized, objective, and transparent. It may be useful for the Agency to seek outside stakeholder membership on the panels.

Staffing considerations are ignored since they are assumed to be a derivative of proper allocation of other resources.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: Resource allocations and program activities conform with existing policy and contribute to specific results targets.			
RESULT NAME: SO 2: General Application of Common Weights and Common Indicators			
Intermediate Indicator 2.2.1: Portion of country-level SOs in which performance is measured by one or more common indicators.			
Unit of Measure: Percentage	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: NMS	1996(B)		
Indicator Description: The indicator is an arithmetic expression: <div style="text-align: center;"> Number of SOs which contribute in a significant positive way to change in a common indicator <u>at the Agency objective level</u> _____ The total number of SOs </div>	1997		
Comments:	1998		
	1999		
	2000(T)		

SO#3: Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience

1. Performance Analysis

a. Objective Level Summary

PPC, through the USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE), leads USAID in learning from development experience. PPC/CDIE informs Agency decision making by 1) distilling and disseminating development experience to practitioners and senior policy advisors; 2) maintaining the Agency's institutional memory; 3) providing information and documents in response to requests from USAID by managers and other development professionals in the field; 4) conducting field evaluations, performance analyses, and desk studies on specific topics of immediate relevance for policy or practice and 5); disseminating key findings and information on PM&E activities through publications, newsletters, and a variety of innovative electronic media; and PM&E policy and practices through seminars, informal groups, and formal meetings.

b. Intermediate Result-Level Performance Review

IR 3.1: Cost effective evaluations which provide USAID managers with lessons from experience and policy guidance.

Work in this area over the past months has yielded:

- 13 evaluations and studies providing clear, actionable policy and programmatic recommendations for Agency operations in the areas of post-conflict elections assistance, democratic local governance, legislative strengthening and food aid programming.

Specific examples include:

- a retrospective of 50 years of USAID assistance to Costa Rica, which examined the impact of U.S. development programs in relationship to the country's development patterns and progress, and that will prove useful to USAID programs in similar country circumstances; and
- a study, commissioned by the Administrator, of the \$1.5 billion that has been invested in these Funds, principally in the former Soviet Union. The study found that the Enterprise Funds were not the best and most useful tool for private sector development in most development situations, and concluded that USAID should oppose Congressional efforts to replicate the Funds.

IR 3.2: Development experience, evaluation, statistical and performance measurement information is routinely accessed and used by Agency staff and development partners in performing their jobs.

In seeking this result, PPC/CDIE:

- responded to approximately 49,000 information requests, including requests for more than 124,000 documents and nearly 3,000 information syntheses supporting activity design,

- implementation and evaluation by direct hire employees and development partners;
- expanded "CDIE OnLine", a corporate web homepage, which "puts development experience knowledge to work" by Agency staff, to include home pages for the Economic and Social Data Services, Research and Reference Services and the Development Information Center;
- expanded CDIE_Connection, an innovative communications tool, to disseminate Agency development experience and results to targeted Agency audiences;
- developed an outreach strategy for marketing, promoting and obtaining valuable feedback from existing and prospective customers of CDIE services, particularly foreign service nationals and development partners;
- met customer needs by administering 21 buy-ins. (These include the U.S.-Asia Environmental Partnership, the Leland Initiative, Democracy and Governance Research and Analysis Unit, Africa Bureau Information Center and the Center for Trade and Investment Services.)
- maintained the Agency's Economic and Social Data Base and made it desktop accessible to Agency managers through USAID's corporate web site. (Products include two comprehensive publications, "United States Merchandise Trade with Developing Countries", the "Latin America and the Caribbean Selected Economic and Social Data", and the "Global Education Database".)
- completed the conversion of its Development Information System to the new Development Experience System. It also replaced its micrographic technologies for document processing with more cost-effective document scanning technologies, and launched an acquisition program for electronic documents and reports. Both programs will provide future online access of full-text development experience reports at the desktops of Agency and development partner staff.

2. Expected Progress through FY 1999 and Management Actions

During the next two years, CDIE will:

- complete its long-term analysis of donor assistance to post-conflict countries, including an analysis of emergency food assistance and its relationship to longer term development assistance; an examination of reconciliation programs in war-torn societies, peace committees, scientific collaboration, community level reconstruction, income generating and civil society strengthening activities; the plight of women in the aftermath of civil war; and the issue of civilian security in these countries;
- complete a multi-country study of girl's education, examining the interventions and approaches that have been most successful in ameliorating the gender gap in this area;
- review USAID's experience in developing capital markets and private sector development; and
- look at cross-sectoral linkages between achieving democracy objectives and program objectives in other sectors at the community level;
- implement a new outreach strategy for development information services;
- establish a new Agency library in the Ronald Reagan building; and
- continue to enhance and refine document and information delivery systems, including the introduction of a USAID development experience home page on the Internet;
- continue a major shift from a request driven library, research and referral system to an online system where Agency staff and development partners can do their own research at their desktop;
- through buy-ins, continue to assist operating units to identify development information resources

through the Internet and to train and assist them in accessing and applying these resources themselves.

The elements of the Bureau's management contract in this area remain valid.

3. Performance Monitoring Tables

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience			
RESULT NAME: SO 3.1: Cost-effective evaluations which provide USAID managers with lessons from experience and policy guidance.			
Indicator 3.1.1: Completion of impact evaluations, field studies, and desk studies.			
Unit of Measure: Number of studies	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/CDIE	1998 (B)	5	
Indicator Description: This indicator tracks the implementation of USAID's Annual Evaluation Agenda. This agenda, approved by the administrator, establishes the topics to be evaluated over a two-year time frame.	1999	Rqst/Actl	
Comments:	2000	4	
	2001	4	
	2002	4	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience			
RESULT NAME: SO 3.1: Cost-effective evaluations which provide USAID managers with lessons from experience and policy guidance.			
Indicator 3.1.2: New policy guidance generated.			
Unit of Measure: Number of Policy Guidance	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/CDIE	1998(B)	N/A	
Indicator Description: This indicator is an indirect measure of the relevance to USAID policy formulation of studies. This measure will track the number of lessons and recommendations that get incorporated into formal policy (APD), guidance and informal policy statements which impact on Agency practice and operations.	1999	Rqst/Actl	
Comments:	2000		
	2001		
	2002		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience			
RESULT NAME: SO 3.2: Development experience, evaluation, statistical and performance measurement information is routinely accessed and used by Agency staff and development partners in performing their jobs.			
Indicator 3.2.1: Requests received and processed from Agency staff and development partners.			
Unit of Measure: Number of information requests per year.	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/CDIE	1996	48,000	49,000
Indicator Description: This is the total number of requests received from Agency staff and development partners for development experience, statistical, evaluation, and performance information each year.	1997	47,000	
Comments: Increased end-user/customer access to on-line development experience resources. More emphasis on training Agency staff and development partners to access Agency experience directly from Agency corporate web, CDIE OnLine and Internet.	1998	46,000	
	1999	45,000	
	2000	44,000	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Agency decision-making is informed by the lessons of experience.			
RESULT NAME: SO 3.2: Development experience, evaluation, statistical and performance measurement information is routinely accessed and used by Agency staff in performing their jobs.			
Intermediate Indicator 3.2.1: Number of Agency and development partner library patrons and CDIE OnLine users.			
Unit of Measure: Number of patrons/users.	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/CDIE	1996	11,000	12,725
Indicator Description: This is the total number of users/customers which access CDIE OnLine (Intranet and Internet) to use the Development Experience System, Economic and Social Data Services, Research and Reference Services, Development Experience Clearinghouse Services, and the total number of Development Information Center library patrons.	1997	12,000	
Comments: The Development Information Center (DIC) is relocating to the Ronald Reagan Building in FY97. At the same time its patronage is changing from USAID and the public, to USAID only. LPA's Public Information Center will be serving the public. The DIC will provide broader library services to the Agency. CDIE OnLine will be formally promoted in late FY97. The Internet version for USAID development partners will be available in FY98.	1998	13,000	
	1999	14,000	
	2000	15,000	

SO#4: Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs and other important constituencies bring increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation

1. Performance Analysis

a. Objective Level Summary:

Over the past year, USAID (PPC/DP) has led the donor community to agreement on a new post-cold war assistance strategy that emphasizes results and clear development targets at both the country and global level, local ownership and leadership of development efforts, a development partnership that stresses the obligations of both donors and recipients, a renewed commitment to sustainable development within the context of democratic and open market economies, and which begins to articulate a principle of differentiation among development programs according to local conditions and commitment. This new consensus has been reflected in both the OECD Ministerial meetings and at the G-7 Summit, and in the World Bank Development Committee. Cooperation among major donors, especially the European Commission, the Japanese, and the World Bank continues to expand with

increased sharing of priorities and a division of labor. USAID's New Partnerships Initiative has moved ahead with the publication of the "NPI Resource Guide," a strategic model and compendium of field case studies and programming tools, that has found broad acceptance among other donors, external partners, and USAID field missions as a way to operationalize USAID reengineering principles such as local ownership, development partnerships, reform of the enabling environment and more effective capacity building at the community level.

PPC/CDIE represented USAID in a variety of national and international fora on performance monitoring, evaluation, strategic planning, development experience databases, and other aspects of "managing for results". It represents the Agency at the DAC's Expert Group on Aid Evaluation (EGE), and has taken the lead in several key elements of their workplan, including the Group's recently completed, 3-year study of participatory development and good governance. PPC/CDIE recently accepted the chair of a new EGE Steering Committee to guide the Group's work in support of the DAC's strategy "Shaping the 21st Century". It also chairs the International Network for Development Information Exchange (INDIX), and presents Agency results to groups such as the American Evaluation Association. PPC units provided briefings and hosted meetings for dozens of visiting donor and host government officials, made innumerable presentations to groups like Interaction, ODC, OMB, and the interagency GPRA group. PPC/CDIE field teams provided briefings and training on USAID's reengineered strategic planning and PM&E systems to USAID partners, including other donors, recipient country officials and NGOs. The evaluation newsletter, which highlights articles on USAID evaluation findings, PM&E methods "best practices", and news, has a wide readership among other donors and the broad development community.

b. Intermediate Result-Level Performance Review:

IR 4.1: Increased and/or more effective USAID collaboration with other donors.

- The 2nd year of the US-EU New Transatlantic Agenda permitted a significant expansion of cooperative activity in the LAC region --especially in the areas of democracy and governance. Cooperation in Haiti was extensive. Small, but ground-breaking activities in democracy and governance were initiated in both Africa and Asia. The first bilateral consultations between ANE Bureau and DG-1a took place.
- USAID is also working with Japan to experiment with implementing new donor strategies adopted by the OECD/DAC. Establishment of a USAID position at the World Bank in the USED's office has permitted a significant expansion of consultation and cooperation in Africa.
- The PPC fieldreps positions in Brussels, Tokyo, and Geneva have been instrumental in facilitating expanding cooperation in key humanitarian and transition activities worldwide.

IR 4.2: U.S. leadership among development partners -- gaining partners' support for U.S. approaches and priorities. Examples:

- The OECD/DAC continues to play a key role in harmonizing U.S. policies with those of other donors. Noteworthy this year has been a new donor consensus on "peace, conflict and development," on corruption in OECD procurement practices in developing countries, a new

post-cold war development strategy for the donors, and a major international conference on the role of emerging donors. The USAID representative at the OECD/DAC is providing direct assistance to the Czech Republic's new aid program.

- USAID has effected a significant reduction of the U.S. contribution to IFAD, while at the same time successfully completing replenishment negotiations and adoption of new governance rules--a significant set of reforms in which the USG position has prevailed.
- A periodic meeting with bilateral and multilateral lending institutions in Washington has been established and focused on USAID policy messages that we wish to bring to donor attention quickly.

Specifically in the area of PM&E, PPC/CDIE:

- chaired (United States) a Steering Committee of the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation which prepared a synthesis of the results of studies of human rights, legal systems, participation, decentralization, privatization and public sector management.
- developed, through its leadership of the International Network for Development Information Exchange (INDIX) Steering Committee, guidelines for obtaining and sharing data on development activities that are in the "pipeline". By sharing this information among donors earlier, the potential for improved collaboration in development activities is increased.
- shared via two new issues of the USAID Evaluation News the results of recent evaluation studies with a USAID's partners, other donors, NGOs, and other important constituencies.
- provided USAID partners, other donors, NGOs and the broader development community with open access to USAID's automated development experience database--and contributed, as it does annually, USAID's inputs into the DAC's evaluation report inventory.
- prepared a comprehensive text on post-civil war society, working closely with the Danish aid agency, DANIDA, which published its book, *Rebuilding Societies After Civil War: Critical Role for International Assistance*. DANIDA distributed over 1,000 copies among PVOs, NGOs, research institutions and development agencies throughout the developing world.
- developed jointly with USAID/Paraguay "partnership model" for conducting strategic planning and program implementation collaboratively with other donors/development partners.
- provided US lessons, approaches and priorities to 3 of USAID's donor partners which attended the third annual "Summer Seminar", held in June 1997.

IR 4.3: New Partnerships Initiative (NPI) provides USAID and development partners with a model for development assistance that stresses local capacity building and public-private partnership within a results-based framework.

Phase two of NPI has been completed with the publication of the "NPI Resource Guide" which provides both program tools and field-based studies for implementing a decentralized development strategy based on public-private partnerships, a strong results framework, and which links national-level policy and institutional reform with local capacity building. There has been broad participation in this phase--fifteen missions participated in field tests, and over 100 external partners have been actively engaged in the process. External interest in and support for the NPI approach has been widespread among other donors and within the NGO community following the publication of the "Resource Guide." Over 400

copies of the "Resource Guide have been distributed, and the electronic version has received over 500 "hits" in a single month. The NPI process has made a clear operational link between USAID's reengineering principles and processes and some of the Agency's leading edge development activities. This linkage has solicited widespread external endorsement and is also beginning to produce emulation.

The Bureau's management contract in this area remains valid.

2. Expected Progress Through FY1999 and Management Action

During the next two years, PPC/DP will:

- coordinate implementation of a series of development initiatives specified in the Denver Summit to feed into discussions at the Birmingham Summit to institutionalize the development component of future Summits;
- leverage IFAD projects in support of selected Mission food security and economic growth SOs;
- work for reduction of IFAD's administrative costs and reform of weak sector policies;
- assure that the TICAD II Tokyo Conference endorses the major thrust of U.S. development policy in Africa;
- cooperate with other donors to implement the DAC Partnership Strategy, leading to significant progress in reaching DAC targets, and monitoring progress;
- seek USAID and Japan agreement on principles for support of private sector infrastructure investment;
- increase support by key donors for democracy/governance activities;
- strengthen cooperation with other key donors of alternative development programs to combat narcotics production;
- work with the EC to strengthen cooperation in African transition countries;
- implement USAID-EC agreements to cooperate in immunization and epidemic preparedness and implementation of a food aid code of conduct;
- expand USAID-EC cooperation in ANE region on civil society programs;
- reach agreement on criteria for admission of new donors to the DAC;
- encourage the DAC to increase cross-sectoral linkages in activities and expand cooperation with other international organizations and non-governmental actors;
- expand the role of the DAC as a donor forum for coordination democracy/governance activities;
- expand the dialogue with non-governmental actors on their role in development assistance and in building society-to-society linkages;
- assist each bureau in developing a donor coordination strategy;
- develop a strategy for USAID relations and support for emerging donors;
- provide direct support for priority transition country task forces;
- improve support to bureaus' donor coordination activities and for sectoral donor coordination activities;
- work to assure that initial UN reform brings greater policy coherence and enhanced coordination in the field with key partners;
- work to assure that UN reforms reflect better linkages between humanitarian and development efforts; and

- establish informal donor network for post-conflict transitions.

Examples of plans to strengthen collaboration on performance measurement and evaluation (PM&E) with our development partners during FY98-99 include:

- continued leadership roles in INDIX and in the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation (EGE). CDIE will finalize a plan of action for the EGE's work on Shaping the 21st Century (S-21) and lead/participate in at least one joint sector assessment.
- representing USAID on the DAC Working Party on Statistical Problems, as this group begins to select indicators and monitor performance against S-21 goals and targets.
- encouraging broad participation of other donors, NGOs/PVOs, researchers and scholars in a USAID-sponsored conference on promoting democracy, human rights, and reintegration in post-conflict societies (October 1997).
- sponsoring several informal seminars with the evaluation offices of other donors and international agencies, in order to share results of evaluation studies on topics of mutual interest, and compare performance monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
- sharing USAID's experience with implementing performance monitoring systems and results-oriented management.

The elements of the Bureau's management contract in this area remain valid.

3. Performance Monitoring Tables

Strategic Objective 4: Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs and other important constituencies bringing increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation.			
Result Name: SO 4.1: Increased and/or more effective USAID collaboration with other donors.			
Indicator 4(a): Consultations with partners, agreements on policies and program approaches reached, working arrangements established or supported, identification of USAID priorities vis-a-vis partners.			
Unit of Measure: Discrete events and processes in place.	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/DP	1998(B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New consultative arrangement set up for G-7 Development Ministers - Develop with each Bureau strategies for cooperation with leading donors - Increase coordination of key analytical work among donors to harmonize strategies 	
Indicator Description: This indicator identifies fora in which policy and program dialogue can take place and focuses on the establishment and maintenance of institutional arrangements for such dialogue, and the conditions for effective USAID leadership.	1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of development programs institutionalized in G-7 Summit process - Cooperation with EC expanded to USAID strategic objectives - USAID and DAC principles are reflected in UN reforms - Develop strategy for cooperation with emerging donors, Implement IFAD administrative reforms 	
Comments: In today's resource constrained environment, U.S. assistance must be harmonized with that of other multilateral and bilateral donors to achieve its impact. Priority given to particular donors and specific consultative arrangements is a function of the overall size of their programs and their strategic importance in specific sectors, regions, or international organizations.	2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both multilateral and major bilateral donors adopt management mechanisms for linking relief, rehabilitation, and development - More effective division of labor among donors -- multilateral and bilateral 	
	2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lead implementation of self-sufficiency in IFAD - Based on Canadian model extend Internet linkages among all DAC donors 	
	2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of Common Agenda s the longest standing bilateral cooperative relationship - Review of status of IFAD by major donors - Integration of E. European donors and Russia into DAC 	

Strategic Objective 4: Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs and other important constituencies bringing increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation.			
Result Name: SO 4.2: U.S. leadership among development partners -- gaining partners' support for U.S. approaches and priorities.			
Indicator 4 (b): Partners adopt or implement sectoral and geographic objectives complementary to those of USAID; and allocate resources to USAID's priority recipients, or fill gaps due to USAID funding constraints, and/or expand joint/parallel project or program financing with USAID.			
Unit of Measure: Dollars and Discrete events	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/DP, other Bureaus	1998(B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand donor support for democracy programs - Use DAC review of US aid to promote US development strategy and principles - Conduct first comprehensive review of progress on the DAC "Partnership Strategy". 	
Indicator Description: Results are reflected in pledges and policy statements found in key donor communiques, donor budget documents and policy statements, and, in retrospect, OECD/DAC ODA reporting. In addition, specific pilot or high-profile collaborative activities in the field indicate commitment by donors to joint action.	1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - US-Japan cooperation expanded on private sector development and economic growth activities - Reexamine ODA definitions to take into account non-traditional assistance goals - Maintain U.S. Chair of DAC - Expand DAC membership to Greece, Turkey, and Korea - Reach donor consensus on ODA as a catalyst for private resource flows 	
Comments: PPC/DP does not routinely track follow-up actions in the field except under the U.S. - Japan Common Agenda, and the U.S.-EU New Transatlantic Agenda.	2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review role of ODA 	
	2001		
	2002		

Strategic Objective 4: Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs and other important constituencies bringing increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation.			
Result Name: SO 4.3: New Partnerships Initiative(NPI) provides USAID and development partners with a model for development assistance that stresses local capacity building and public-private partnership within a results-based framework.			
Indicator 4 (c): Completion of NPI Resource Guide, establishment of external partner mechanisms, and development of follow-up plan (public information campaign, policy guidance issues, analytical questions resolved).			
Unit of Measure: Discrete documents and mechanisms.	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/DP	1998(B)	- Incorporation of NPI into AGENCY program guidance and results frameworks	
Indicator Description: The indicator is not quantitative, but rather a set of program and policy documents that will facilitate implementation. Also, the indicator will track a variety of outreach documents intended to engage a broad external audience.	1999	- External partners incorporated in Agency strategic planning and donor coordination strategies - NPI approaches incorporated widely in Agency programs -- Civil society role of business incorporated in Agency's economic growth and democracy strategy	
Comments: Following a year of intense field testing, the objective at this stage is to put in place the necessary policy guidance, reporting mechanisms, linkages to external partners, and reference materials to permit NPI to be implemented Agency-wide, and to monitor performance.	2000	- Pilot external partners develop "graduation" strategies - Integrate all major development partners in DAC monitoring and deliberations -- multilateral organizations, NGOs, etc. - Improve major donors support for strategic civil society programs	
	2001		
	2002		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4: Agency partnerships with other donors, NGOs, and other important constituencies bring increased efficiencies and reduced costs in international development cooperation.			
RESULT NAME: SO4.4: Increased and/or more effective USAID collaboration with other donors on PM&E.			
Intermediate Indicator 4.d: Donor Coordination on PM&E issues.			
Unit of Measure: Events, seminars, workshops, training opportunities, publications on which USAID and other donors provide coordination and leadership	FY	Planned	Actual
Source: PPC/CDIE	1996	Participate on the DAC Evaluation Committee	same
Indicator Description: This indicator reflects CDIE's participation and leadership with donor partners in strengthening performance measurement and evaluation of development programs. activities supporting this indicator include joint evaluations, attendance and/or leadership at OECD/DAC meetings as well as collaborative workshops, seminars and/or training activities held which include substantial partner participation.	1997	Chair the DAC Evaluation Committee	same
Comments:	1998	Facilitate joint evaluations DAC 21st Century Indicators	
	1999		
	2000		

PART III: STATUS OF MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

No significant changes in the Bureau's management contract are proposed at this time.

PART IV: RESOURCES REQUEST

Operating Expense and Workforce Levels

Operating Expenses. PPC's overseas mission OE budget request for FY99 is \$1,833,800. The Washington FY99 OE request is \$360,000. The combined total of \$2,193,800 equates to an FY97 total (including ICASS) of \$1,373,700. The significant factors in the \$820,100 increase are:

- costs of anticipated overseas rotations (\$153,800),
- increased salary and benefits of USPSCs and FSNs, including transfer of salary and support costs of one USFDH from the Africa Bureau to PPC (\$140,300),
- increased residential rental and maintenance costs (\$67,700 and \$70,000, respectively), and
- increases in ICASS costs (\$362,200).

These items account for about \$794,000 of the increase. Other miscellaneous anticipated increases in office maintenance, communications, etc., make up the balance of the increase. We do not anticipate any increase in the cost of PPC's Washington operations.

Workforce. The narrative portion of our FY98 BBS included an acknowledgement that PPC understood the necessity to reduce its staff levels consistent with the reductions incurred by those organizational components that manage the Agency's regional and field programs. Since our submission, however, the Administrator has openly acknowledged the Bureau's potential for meeting the policy and reform objectives of the Agency and has expressed his belief that the Bureau can and should play a key role in the future.

We now have a strategy in place to reduce the Bureau's current on-board Washington strength of 73 by 8 in order to reach our FY97 on-board level of 65. With this reduction, the Bureau will have incurred a 22% reduction in staff since the summer of 1996. Any further reductions at this time would be premature. Therefore, we request that PPC's FY97 on-board Washington staff level of 65 be straightlined for FY98 and FY99.

Program Funding

PPC's assigned program funding ceiling for FY99 is \$6,700,000. This is a 10% decrease from actual FY97 allocations of \$7,444,000. Though the reduction will be shared by each of the PPC units, it most affects the operations of CDIE, which absorbs 86% of the Bureau's program funds, *primarily in support of SOs 2 and 3*. (See matrix below for SO allocations.)

In an attempt to reduce budget requirements, CDIE is concentrating less on the full multi-country study impact evaluation and more on limited field evaluations and desk studies. Nonetheless, much of the work on post-conflict societies, which is of high priority for the Agency, must be undertaken in the

field. The \$5,762,000 of FY99 funding requested for CDIE represents a \$667,000 decrease from the FY97 CDIE actuals of \$6,429,000 and a \$853.2 decrease from the CDIE request of \$5,948,200.

Whatever the decrease, it will be accommodated by curtailing the scope of evaluation activities and the level of services provided to Missions in Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E). Funding for other information activities is roughly comparable to FY 97, with CDIE continuing to realize some modest savings with the new production Development Experience System and the desk-top accessibility of current Agency development reports through the new CDIE OnLine Home Page.

The next highest FY99 program budget allocation goes to PPC/SPG, primarily in support of *SOs 1 and 4*. The \$737,000 of FY99 funding requested for PPC/SPG is a \$73,000 reduction from the FY97 actual of \$810,000--and comes in the face of a new and additional requirement above the recent-years' base. (See matrix below for SO allocations.) PPC/SPG has identified several new areas for policy research studies requiring additional funding in FY99. These include, "education and crisis", "global agriculture research policy", "innovations in information and communication technology on primary health care in developing and transition countries," among others. These research studies, which need further development leading to concept proposals and eventual policy and guidance development, would require an additional \$200,000 above the allocation now proposed under the FY99 ceiling.

The \$205,000 balance of the program funding request will support TA and special studies and outside participation of partners and customers in programs and events relating to achievement of *SOs 2 and 4*.

Decisions about the siting of PPC/CDIE institutional contractors following USAID's move may have implications for the budgets presented above. The projected additional annual recurrent cost of having these contractors work outside USG-provided space is estimated at \$500,000 (program funds). In addition, there is a one-time, \$500,000 (estimated) cost of installing and connecting contractor computers, phones, etc., at their new quarters.

Strategic Objective	PPC/SPG	PPC/PC	PPC/CDIE	PPC/DP	Totals
#1	\$ 469,500	\$ 34,000			\$ 503,500
#2		\$ 70,000	\$ 1,152,400		\$ 1,222,400
#3	\$ 65,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 4,609,600		\$ 4,704,600
#4	\$ 202,500				\$ 269,500
Totals	\$ 737,000	\$ 134,000	\$ 5,762,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 6,700,000